

## **REMARKS**

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 25 and 29, and rejected claims 3-30 under 35 USC §103(a). These objections and rejections are fully traversed below.

Claims 15, 18, 25 and 28-30 have been amended to correct minor informalities and/or further clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. Claims 3-30 remain pending.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

### **RETURN OF FORM PTO 1449**

Applicants filed an Information Disclosure Statement and PTO Form 1449 along with the initial filing of the above-identified patent application on September 30, 2000. Although the Examiner kindly returned other PTO Forms 1449 after having initialed the same, the Examiner has not yet returned an initialed version of the PTO Form 1449 submitted on September 30, 2000. It is respectfully requested that the Examiner return an initialed version of such PTO Form 1449 indicating the Examiner's consideration of the references identified thereon.

### **OBJECTION TO CLAIMS 25 AND 29**

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 25 and 29 due to minor informalities with the claim language. Claims 25 and 29 have been amended to overcome the minor informalities identified by the Examiner. Hence, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the objection to claims 25 and 29.

### **REJECTION OF CLAIMS 3-30 UNDER 35 USC §103**

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 3-30 under 35 USC §103(a) as being anticipated by Angles et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,933,811) in combination with Minor et al. (U.S. Patent 5,740,252). This rejection is fully traversed below.

Claim 3 pertains to a system for delivering customized web pages to users. The system of claim 3 includes at least one content server and a centralized demographic server. According to claim 3, “said content server directs a requesting user to said demographic server where particular demographic information associated with the requesting user is stored, said demographic server then retrieves the particular demographic information associated with the requesting user, and then the retrieved particular demographic information is provided to said content server.” Claim 3, lines 7-11.

Hence, the particular demographic information associated with the requesting user is retrieved from the centralized demographics server and provided to said content server. In contrast, Angles et al. teaches accessing an advertisement provider computer. Such advertisement provider computer generates a custom advertisement based on a customer’s profile. The custom advertisement is then combined with the offering from the content provider computer and displayed to the customer.

In contrast, Angles et al. merely provides customized advertisements. As a result, Angles et al. does not teach or suggest retrieving particular demographic information associated with a requesting user from a centralized demographic server and providing same to a content server.

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner admits that Angles et al. fails to teach “a centralized demographic server that stores demographic information on a plurality of registered users, the demographic information being self-represented.” In an effort to overcome this deficiency, the Examiner combined Minor et al. with Angles et al. To support such combination of references, the Examiner stated:

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have incorporated the centralized server, as taught by Minor into the customization

system of Angles for the purpose of enabling uniform service to multiple users.

However, Minor et al. does not teach or suggest use of a demographic server that is separate from the entry web site 32A or a remote web site 34A. Further, the remote web site 34A does not interact with another server (e.g., a central demographics server) to request or acquire demographic information.

Moreover, there is no motivation to combine Minor et al. with Angles et al. in the manner proposed by the Examiner. Angles et al. pertains to an advertisement system that can provide customized electronic advertisements on web pages displayed on user computers, while Minor et al. pertains to techniques for passing demographic information between computers by associating a computer operator with a set of demographic information. The advertisement system of Angles et al. already makes use of demographic information; therefore, Angles et al. has no need to make any use of the techniques for passing demographic information described in Minor et al.

Therefore, it is submitted that claim 3 is patentably distinct from Angles et al., alone or in combination with Minor et al.

Claims 15, 21 and 28 recite similar limitation to that noted above regarding claim 3. Claim 15 pertains to a computer implemented method for utilizing demographic information over a network of computers. Among other things, claim 15 recites:

accessing a central demographics server via the network to retrieve demographic information pertaining to a particular registered user, the central demographics server storing demographic information pertaining to a plurality of registered users;

providing the demographic information pertaining to the particular registered user from the central demographics server to a computer associated with the particular registered users; and

Claim 15, lines 3-8.

Claim 21 recites a computer implemented method for utilizing demographic information over a network of computers. Claim 21, among other things, recites:

accessing a central demographics server via the network to retrieve demographic information pertaining to the requestor, the requestor being previously registered with the central demographics server in a self-represented manner, and the central

demographics server storing demographic information pertaining to a plurality of registered users and being accessible by a plurality of different content servers;

providing the retrieved demographic information to the content server;

Claim 21, lines 5-10.

Claim 28 is a computer-implemented method for utilizing demographic information over a network of computers. Among other things, claim 28 recites:

(a) receiving, at a content server, a request from a user to access a remote web page over the network;

(b) retrieving self-represented demographic information for the user, the self-represented demographic information is retrieved from a central demographics server coupled to the network of computers and provided to the content server, the demographic information being self-represented and does not particularly identify the user; and

Claim 28, lines 3-8.

Accordingly, it is submitted that claims 15, 21 and 28 are also patentably distinct from Angles et al., alone or in combination with Minor et al.

Based on the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 3, 15, 21 and 28 are patentably distinct from Angles et al., alone or in combination with Minor et al. In addition, it is submitted that dependent claims 4-14, 16-20, 22-27, 29 and 30 are also patentably distinct for at least the same reasons. The additional limitations recited in the independent claims or the dependent claims are not further discussed as the above-discussed limitations are clearly sufficient to distinguish the claimed invention from Angles et al. and/ or Minor et al. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 3-30 under 35 USC §103(a).

## **SUMMARY**

It is submitted that claims 25 and 29 are no longer objectionable. In addition, it is submitted that claims 3-30 are patentably distinct from the cited references.

Reconsideration of the application and an early Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

If there are any issues remaining which the Examiner believes could be resolved through either a Supplemental Response or an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Applicant hereby petitions for an extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee for such extension or any further fee required in connection with the filing of this Amendment is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0388 (RLC1G000).

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "C. Douglass Thomas".

C. Douglass Thomas  
Reg. No. 32,947

Telephone: (650) 961-8300